

### Remarks

Claims 1-7, 14 and 18-25 are pending. Claims 2, 6, 7, 19, 23 and 24 have been canceled by this amendment.

Claims 1-7 and 20 were objected to for informalities. Claims 2-7 were also objected to due to their dependence on claim 1. These informalities have been corrected with the amendments to the claims above. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 14 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims have been amended to read "computer readable medium" and therefore withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-7 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feinleib (US Patent No. 6,272,532) in view of Okazaki et al (US Patent No. 6,578,067).

Feinleib discloses a reminder service. Okazaki discloses a unique server that provides a unique service through a firewall by directly transmitted requests. There is no indication that e-mail is desirable or that asynchronous communication is even possible.

There is no motivation to combine Okazaki and Feinleib. Okazaki does not mention email at all. Feinleib does not mention a radio receiver at all. Feinleib describes an electronic reminder system primarily described for reminding people. "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." *MPEP 2143.01 quoting In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)*. There is no suggestion in either Okazaki or Feinleib to add the email functionality of Feinleib to the unique server system of Okazaki. Further, Okazaki is directed to a direct request system, not an asynchronous system like an e-mail system.

Regarding Feinleib, the mail receiver is on a central computer. As stated in Feinleib, col. 2, lines 59-62, "Central computer 18 may comprise an *email server computer* which receives all SMTP packets forwarded to a particular port at its IP address or may comprise an

email client computer which users POP or IMAP to *retrieve email message addressed to it which are stored on an email server computer.*” Therefore, the actual email is received by an email server.

Okazaki is directed to a system in which a unique server allows transmission of direct requests through a firewall. There is no parsing or configuration instructions being extracted from an e-mail message received on a message server on the camera.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to more particularly point out that the camera contains an e-mail server. This is disclosed in the specification on page 4, among other places.

Therefore the combination of references does not teach, show or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 14.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 3-5 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 18-25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feinleib in view of Bauer et al. (US Patent No. 6,735,193).

Feinleib discloses a reminder system. Bauer discloses a music-on-hold system for an IP telephone that is controlled by the party on-hold, rather than by the party placing that person on hold.

There is no motivation to combine Bauer and Feinleib. Bauer does not mention email at all. Feinleib does not mention a radio receiver at all. Feinleib describes an electronic reminder system primarily described for reminding people. “The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the

prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination.” *MPEP 2143.01 quoting In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)*. There is no suggestion in either Bauer or Feinleib to add the email functionality of Feinleib to the phone system of Bauer. Further, Bauer is directed to an IP telephony system, not a radio receiver.

Regarding Feinleib, the mail receiver is on a central computer. As stated in Feinleib, col. 2, lines 59-62, “Central computer 18 may comprise an *email server computer* which receives all SMTP packets forwarded to a particular port at its IP address or may comprise an email client computer which users POP or IMAP to *retrieve email message addressed to it which are stored on an email server computer.*” Therefore, the actual email is received by an email server.

The addition of Bauer to the combination does not overcome this deficiency. Further, Bauer discloses a system in which a user at the far end from the device placing the far end on hold may alter the music on-hold by pressing buttons on a phone. There is no need to send an e-mail, as the device being operated on is local to the user at the far end. The operation of the device is by the party on hold, so the need to transmit that command across the network as in an e-mail does not exist. See Bauer, col. 3, lines 27-35 and col. 4, lines 30-35.

Claims 18 and 25 have been amended to more particularly point out that the message is received at an e-mail server on the radio receiver. It is therefore submitted that claims 18 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 18 and inherently contain all of the limitations of that claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claim, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims. It is therefore submitted that claims 20-22 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure: Amini et al. (US Patent No. 6,698,021).

Claims 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-7 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feinleib (US Patent No. 6,272,532) in view of Okazaki et al (US Patent No. 6,578,067).

Claims 18-25 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feinleib in view of Bauer et al. (US Patent No. 6,735,193).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is no considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.


#### Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 32231

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349  
Of Attorneys for Intel Corporation

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
210 SW Morrison St., Suite 400  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 222-3613